

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04336 01 OF 02 241340 Z

41

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 /026 W

----- 023840

P 241237 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8980

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 VIENNA 4336

EXDIS

NOFORN

FROM US REP MBFR

EO 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MBFR: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REPS MAY 23

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. ON MAY 23, US REP HAD DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REP KHLESTOV AT LATTER' S REQUEST. KHLESTOV WAS ACCOMPANIED BY MOVCHAN. DISCUSSION FOCUSED ON TREATMENT OF AGENDA AND COMMUNIQUE AND ALSO ON POSSIBLE DATE OF MBFR NEGOTIATIONS. US REP SAID HE SAW NO GOOD PROSPECT OF AGREEMENT ON AGENDA AND URGED ADOPTION OF PROPOSAL ADVANCED BY ALLIED REPS ON MAY 22 ( DETAILS IN SEPTTEL) THAT WORK ON COMMUNIQUE NOW BEGIN. SOVIET REPS ASSERTED THAT THEY WERE SOMEWHAT AT A LOSS ON HOW TO PROCEED SINCE THEY DID HAVE DIRECT INSTRUCTIONS TO WORK ON AGENDA. THEY INDICATED THEY WERE NOT OPPOSED TO THE PROPOSAL ON ITS MERITS, BUT CLAIMED THAT THEY WERE UNCERTAIN AS TO HOW TO PRESENT IT TO MOSCOW IN A FAVORABLE LIGHT. AFTER DISCUSSION, THEY PROPOSED THAT THE BEST PROCEDURE MIGHT BE TO WORK ON AGENDA AND COMMUNIQUE IN THE SAME DOCUMENT. US REP SAID HE WOULD TRANSMIT THESE VIEWS TO THE ALLIES AND REPORT THEIR REACTION. SOVIETS RAISED QUESTION OF DATE OF MBFR NEGOTIATIONS. US REP SAID ALLIES AND US WANTED ORIGINAL SOVIET PROPOSAL TO BE MAINTAINED AND THAT OCTOBER 30,

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04336 01 OF 02 241340 Z

1973 WOULD BE LATEST POSSIBLE DATE TO BEGIN NEGOTIATIONS.  
SOVIET REPS MADE NO SPECIFIC RESPONSE TO THIS POINT OTHER  
THAN TO SAY THAT THEY HAD A BIG PROBLEM. END SUMMARY.

2. AT REQUEST OF KHLESTOV, US REP MET WITH HIM AND MOVCHAN  
MORNING OF MAY 23. KHLESTOV BEGAN BY ASKING US REP FOR HIS OWN  
VIEWS ON THE FEASIBILITY OF COMING TO A COMPROMISE WORDING  
ON AGENDA. KHLESTOV SAID IT HAD BEEN AGREED EARLIER BY THE US  
AND USSR THAT PART OF THE WORK OF THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS  
WOULD BE TO DRAW UP AN AGENDA FOR THE LATER NEGOTIATIONS.  
THESE WERE STILL HIS INSTRUCTIONS. HE IMPLIED THAT WHAT HE HAD  
IN MIND WAS TO WORK OUT AN AGENDA WITH ONE MAIN HEADING  
ALONG LINES OF RECENT SOVIET PROPOSALS AND PERHAPS TO ADD TO  
IT ONE OR TWO SUITABLY FORMULATED ITEMS FROM THE AGENDA LIST  
OF THE ALLIES. HE WAS IN A SOMEWHAT OF A QUANDRY AS TO  
WHAT TO DO NOW FOLLOWING THE ALLIED PROPOSAL OF MAY 22 THAT THE  
AGENDA BE LEFT TO ONE SIDE AND THAT THE PARTICIPANTS PROCEED  
TO DRAFT A FINAL COMMUNIQUE. HE HAD TWO PROBLEMS IN PARTICULAR.  
FIRST, THAT THERE WAS A US- SOVIET AGREEMENT ON THIS POINT  
WHICH HE BELIEVED SHOULD BE HONORED, AND SECOND, THAT HIS  
AUTHORITIES IN MOSCOW IN FACT EXPECTED THAT SOME AGENDA FORM-  
ULATION WOULD BE WORKED OUT.

3. US REP SAID THAT THE VIEWS PUT FORWARD ON PREVIOUS DAY TO  
THE EFFECT THAT EACH SIDE SHOULD BE FREE TO RAISE WHATEVER IT  
WISHED DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS AND THAT THE PARTICIPANTS  
SHOULD MOVE ON TO DISCUSSION OF THE COMMUNIQUE REPRESENTED THE  
VIEWS OF ALL ALLIES, INCLUDING THE US. KHLESTOV SAID HE HAD  
ASSUMED THAT THE NEXT PHASE OF DISCUSSION ON THE AGENDA WOULD  
BE ONE WHERE ACTUAL FORMULAE WOULD BE WORKED UP AND THAT IT  
MIGHT BE IMPOSSIBLE TO FIT IN SOME OF THE ALLIED ELEMENTS AS  
ITEMS UNDER THE GENERAL HEADINGS PROPOSED BY THE SOVIETS.  
THE US REP SAID HE DOUBTED SUCH A COURSE WOULD BE FEASIBLE.  
THE ALLIES CORPORATELY DID NOT FIND THE SOVIET SINGLE FORM-  
ULATION ADEQUATE. THE ALLIES HAD WORKED FOR MANY MONTHS TO  
DEVELOP AGENDA FORMULAE WHICH WERE IN FACT NEUTRAL WHEN  
VIEWED OBJECTIVELY. THE ALLIES, INCLUDING OF COURSE THE US,  
WOULD WANT SUBSTANTIALLY ALL OF THESE POINTS TO BE INCLUDED  
IN AN AGENDA. HE SAW NO PROSPECT OF DOING THIS WITHOUT GREAT  
EXPENDITURE OF EFFORT. HE DOUBTED WHETHER THIS EFFORT  
WOULD IN FACT BE WELL SPENT IN VIEW OF THE POSSIBILITY THAT  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04336 01 OF 02 241340 Z

EVEN IF AN AGENDA WERE ADOPTED IN VIENNA AFTER INTENSIVE  
WORK, IT MIGHT NOT BE FOLLOWED PRECISELY IN THE ACTUAL  
NEGOTIATIONS SEVERAL MONTHS LATER. IT THEREFORE SEEMED A  
RATIONAL APPROACH TO RESERVE THE RIGHT OF BOTH SIDES TO RAISE  
THOSE AGENDA ITEMS THEY WISH TO, TO NOTE IN THE FINAL COMMUNIQUE  
THAT THERE HAD BEEN A USEFUL EXCHANGE OF DISCUSSION ON THE AGENDA  
AND TO TURN NOW TO DISCUSSION OF A COMMUNIQUE TEXT.

SECRET  
NMAFVVZCZ

ADP000  
SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04336 02 OF 02 241356 Z

42  
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 /026 W  
----- 023999

P 241237 Z MAY 73  
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8981  
INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 VIENNA 4336

EXDIS

NOFORN

FROM US REP MBFR

4. KHLESTOV SAID HE STILL FELT HE HAD A BUREAUCRATIC PROBLEM IN THAT HE HAD INSTRUCTIONS TO OBTAIN AN AGENDA AND MOSCOW MIGHT REACT HOSTILELY TO THE IDEA OF TOTALLY DROPPING THIS CONCEPT. BESIDES, IN THE SOVIET VIEW, A COMMUNIQUE WAS MERELY A PUBLIC REFLECTION OF SOME DECISION ALREADY ARRIVED AT AND DID NOT HAVE ANY STATUS AS A RECORD OF UNDERSTANDING. THE US REP SAID THIS WAS NOT HIS VIEW OF A COMMUNIQUE WHICH SHOULD IN FACT EMBODY THE AGREED OVERALL OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS AS A WHOLE. KHLESTOV SAID HE STILL HAD PROBLEMS ABOUT DROPPING THE IDEA OF TRYING TO FIND AN AGREED AGENDA.

5. MOVCHAN ASKED HOW AN OVERALL COMMUNIQUE MIGHT LOOK AS REGARDS STRUCTURE. THE US REP SAID IT MIGHT HAVE AN INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPH, FOLLOWED BY THE PARAGRAPH PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES WHICH SOVIETS HAD RECEIVED IN DISCUSSION THE PREVIOUS EVENING (DETAILS IN SEPTEL) AND ANOTHER PARAGRAPH REFERRING TO PROCEDURES AND THE USEFUL AGENDA DISCUSSION PLUS A POINT PERMITTING BOTH SIDES TO RAISE ISSUES OF CONSEQUENCE DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS. AFTER FURTHER DISCUSSION, MOVCHAN PROPOSED ON A PERSONAL AND INFORMAL BASIS THAT, INSTEAD OF DROPPING COMPLETELY FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE AGENDA IN FAVOR OF WORK ON A COMMUNIQUE, PERHAPS BOTH EXERCISES MIGHT BE COMBINED TO A CER-

SECRET  
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04336 02 OF 02 241356 Z

TAIN EXTENT. THUS, ONE MIGHT HAVE A PARAGRAPH ALONG THE LINES OF THE ALLIED PROPOSAL AS A SECOND PARAGRAPH, ALTHOUGH OF COURSE THE SOVIETS HAD DIFFERENT NOMENCLATURE AND FORMULATIONS OF THEIR OWN IN MIND. ONE MIGHT IN THE THIRD PARAGRAPH, STATE THAT THERE HAD BEEN USEFUL EXCHANGES ON AGENDA. THEN, ONE MIGHT STATE THAT IT HAD BEEN AGREED THAT THE NEGOTIATIONS " WOULD FOCUS ON" A SPECIFIC SUBJECT MATTER. HERE, ONE WOULD USE ONCE AGAIN WHATEVER AGREED DESIGNATION OR DESCRIPTION HAD BEEN DEVELOPED FOR USE THE SECOND PARAGRAPH. THIS WOULD BE FOLLOWED BY A SENTENCE TO THE EFFECT THAT EACH SIDE RESERVED THE RIGHT TO RAISE ANY ASPECT OF THE MATTER OF INTEREST TO IT DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS.

6. US REP SAID HE COULD SEE SOME POTENTIAL BENEFITS IN THIS APPROACH. ON THE OTHER HAND, IT MIGHT BE CONSIDERED VERY CLOSE TO THE ORIGINAL SOVIET PROPOSAL AND HE COULD GIVE NO CONSIDERED REACTION TO IT UNTIL HE HAD HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS IT WITH HIS ALLIED COLLEAGUES. KHLESTOV SAID THE SAME WAS TRUE FOR THE SOVIETS. THE IDEA SHOULD BE TREATED AS A PERSONAL THOUGHT WITHOUT STATUS AND HE WOULD HAVE TO CHECK IT OUT WITH HIS WARSAW PACT COLLEAGUES. IF TENTATIVE AGREEMENT WAS REACHED THAT IT WAS WORTHWHILE TO PURSUE THIS APPROACH, HE WOULD NEVERTHELESS STILL HAVE TO OBTAIN THE AGREEMENT OF THE SOVIET AUTHORITIES TO MOVE ON TO A DOUBLE- BARRELLED OPERATION INVOLVING WORK ON THE COMMUNIQUE.

7. KHLESTOV ASKED US REP TO GIVE HIM THE ALLIED REACTION TO THE INFORMAL SOVIET SUGGESTION FOR DEALING WITH THE AGENDA AND COMMUNIQUE ISSUES AT SAME TIME. US REP SAID HE WOULD DO SO AS PROMPTLY AS POSSIBLE.

8. US REP GAVE SUMMARY OF ABOVE CONVERSATION TO AD HOC GROUP ON MAY 23 ( SEPTEL).

9. ON MARGIN OF MAY 24 PLENARY, KHLESTOV TOLD US REP HE WAS NOW READY AFTER DISCUSSION WITH PACT COLLEAGUES TO BEGIN INFORMAL DISCUSSION OF COMMUNIQUE ON LINES OF ALLIED PROPOSAL, BUT THAT SOVIETS DID NOT WISH TO DISCUSS DATE AND PLACE UNTIL AFTER REMAINDER OF COMMUNIQUE HAD BEEN AGREED ON. US REP SAID THE ALLIES MIGHT BE WILLING FOR PURPOSES OF INFORMAL DISCUSSION TO BRACKET ISSUE OF DATE AND PLACE IN THE FIRST DISCUSSION OF

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04336 02 OF 02 241356 Z

COMMUNIQUE, BUT THAT THIS ARRANGEMENT COULD HOLD ONLY FOR THE FIRST OCCASION ON WHICH THE MATTER WAS DISCUSSED. AFTER FURTHER EFFORT TO GAIN HIS POINT THAT DATE AND PLACE SHOULD NOT BE DISCUSSED AT ALL UNTIL REMAINDER OF COMMUNIQUE HAD BEEN AGREED ON, KHLESTOV ACCEDED TO GROUND RULES PROPOSED BY US REP AS BASIS FOR FIRST DISCUSSION, WHICH WILL TAKE PLACE MAY 25.

HUMES

SECRET  
NMAFVVZCZ

\*\*\* Current Handling Restrictions \*\*\* EXDIS

\*\*\* Current Classification \*\*\* SECRET

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 24 MAY 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973VIENNA04336  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** RR  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19730554/aaaajtqg.tel  
**Line Count:** 226  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** ACTION SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS, NOFORN  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS, NOFORN  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 20 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <20-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <19-Sep-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 980305  
**Subject:** MBFR: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REPS MAY 23  
**TAGS:** PARM, AU, UR  
**To:** NATO  
SECSTATE WASHDC  
SS  
WASHDC  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005